419

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

OCT 25 1982

U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 376

Current
Policy No. 419

Secretary Shultz

The Quest for Peace

September 12, 1982

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is an address by Secretary Shultz before the United Jewish Appeal, New York City, September 12, 1982.

No theme is more appropriate for my first speech as Secretary of State than the theme of peace. No objective we share is more worthy or more elusive: to attain it requires realism, strength, the capacity to run risks, and the ability to gather trust. It takes sustained goodwill to build up that trust. And it takes serious, fair, and direct bargaining at the negotiating table to hammer out workable and durable agreements.

If we needed any reminder, events of this year make it clear that we do not live in a world of peace. Scarcely a region of the developing world—where peace is crucial for social and economic growth—has been spared. From Indochina to the Horn of Africa, from the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan to the tip of South America, wars raged with frightening intensity and tragic results. Some cases, such as the Soviets' imperialistic war in Afghanistan, are new conflicts where one nation is seeking to extend its power and control. But much of the violence we witnessed this year, including the war over the Falklands, represented only the latest outbreak of long-smouldering disputes. Mankind has advanced his capacity to wage war. But his ability to settle disputes peacefully and to prevent violence remains primitive.

We have clear codes of international morality and law. From the words of the prophets to the rhetoric of 20th century statesmen, mankind has set out standards for individual and international behavior. Over the last two centuries, nations have formed international bodies to adjudicate disputes, resolve conflicts, and promote peace. But the ideal of a world at peace has remained, and will remain, a mirage until nations pursue, as a matter of course, policies rooted in mutual respect and aimed at forging and fostering a just international order.

The formula for peace often requires that we convince our adversaries of the strength of our forces and of our will to defend liberty and security. That same formula demands that we stand prepared to meet with our adversaries and work with them to bridge differences. Despite the catalogue of troubles around the world, there are great opportunities and practical possibilities before us today.

The pursuit of peace with freedom, security, and justice is the essence of America's foreign policy. Our country's commitment to peace is beyond doubt, based on our creative, unrelenting efforts in that cause.

The past year has been a year rich in American efforts for peace. At the President's direction, and with the commitment of American peacekeeping forces, Secretary Haig took the lead in creating the multinational force that helped make good on the historic Israeli move for peace: withdrawal from the Sinai. Deputy Secretary of State Walter Stoessel worked intensively in the crucial final weeks to assure that achievement. Ours was the nation that made a major effort to head off the tragic war in the South Atlantic. We have continued the effort to find peaceful and just settlements to the fighting in Indochina and Afghanistan. With all America behind him—including once again our dedicated men in uniform—Phil Habib [President's special emissary to the Middle East] used every ounce of his legendary skill and stamina to prevent a tragic denouement of the war in Lebanon. We are currently engaged in a major diplomatic effort to achieve Namibian independence and lasting security in southern Africa. We have provided vigorous backing for the international efforts that secured Libya's withdrawal from Chad. And to ease the dangers of nuclear war, the President has proposed major reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons and has offered new proposals to advance the talks on the reduction of conventional forces.

International institutions and resolutions for peace need practical efforts to give them life. Mankind has made astonishing technological and material leaps in the last 40 years. But we must make equally dramatic gains in the political realm if we are to bequeath a safe and secure world of peace to our children.

READEX FICHE

best copy available

S 1.71/4:

I believe we can make those gains. Strength of arms and of will are essential, but no more so than the ability to find that winning mixture of courage and realism. No matter what the obstacles, we must persevere—for there are no more noble nor important goals than peace, freedom, and security.

The President's Peace Initiative in the Middle East

These principles apply fully to that set of goals foremost in our thoughts today—peace in the Middle East and security and success for Israel and her Arab neighbors. No one who has walked the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv and who has talked at length with as many Israeli people as I have can doubt that they want peace and security, and I am dedicated to helping them achieve both.

Against the backdrop of confrontation, despair, and fear that have characterized the search for peace in the Middle East, three key documents spell out how peace might be made a reality.

- The first is U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, which established the basis for a negotiating process founded on the idea of an exchange of territory for real peace.
- The second is the Camp David accords, which—in the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty—led directly to the realization of such an exchange of territory for peace. Camp David calls for a "just, comprehensive, and durable" Middle East peace based on Resolution 242, but builds on it as well by calling for a solution that recognizes "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements" and a "resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects."
- And third, there is the President's speech of September 1. This historic address builds on the earlier documents by stating categorically that our approach to peace will continue to be based on Resolution 242, with its concept of an exchange of territory for peace, and the Camp David accords, which provide for Palestinian self-government with full guarantees for Israel's security.

While I cannot summarize for you the totality of a rich and complex speech, I would like to review four important points made by the President.

First, there should be full safeguards for Israeli security, both internal and external, throughout the transitional period and beyond. The President has made this forcefully clear.

Second, as stated in Camp David, there should be a transitional period of 5 years during which the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza should be permitted to exercise full autonomy.

Third, the United States believes that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of Israeli sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza but must be based on Resolution 242's formula of an exchange of territory for peace. Our preference is for self-government by the Palestinians in association with Jordan, with the extent of withdrawal determined by the quality of peace offered in return.

Fourth, the United States also believes that peace cannot be achieved by the creation of an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza. The President has stated clearly and unequivocally that we will not support an independent Palestinian state in the territories.

One section of the President's speech especially deserves reading tonight word for word, because it did not appear in the text printed in the *New York Times*. But don't blame the *Times*. The passage was inserted by the President at the very last minute—after the press had received their copies. It was put in because the President wanted to speak from his heart to the people of Israel. The President said this:

> I have personally followed and supported Israel's heroic struggle for survival ever since the founding of the State of Israel 34 years ago. In the pre-1967 borders, Israel was barely 10 miles wide at its narrowest point. The bulk of Israel's population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab armies. I am not about to ask Israel to live that way again.

Those words represent the President's, and America's, fundamental commitment to Israeli security and to genuine peace. Our commitment grows out of a sense of moral obligation but also out of strategic interest. A strong, secure Israel is in our interests and the interests of peace. There will be no peace without Israeli security, but Israel will never be secure without peace. Our vision of the future on the West Bank is one guided by a vision of a secure Israel living with defensible borders and by our abiding belief that it is not in Israel's long-term interests to try to rule over the more than 1 million Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza.

Approval for the President's initiative is gathering force and momentum, both here at home and abroad. I believe it will gather more and more support as people read and study that speech carefully. The same is true of the Camp David accords on which the President's speech is based. Those who do take the time to read those historic documents soon recognize the genius of Camp David. It is an accomplishment that is a tribute to the statesmanship of the leaders of three great nations—Prime Minister Begin, the late President Sadat, and our own President Carter.

The Opportunity of the Present

Despite the many dark periods of stagnation, setback, and delay since 1967, a look at the long-term trend in the Middle East is encouraging. After a quarter century of sterile conflict and confrontation, the past decade has seen a building momentum toward peace. Three negotiated disengagement agreements have been signed. President Sadat paid his historic and stirring visit to Jerusalem. There was the great achievement of the Camp David framework and the signing in 1979 and fulfillment this past April of the first treaty of peace between Israel and an Arab neighbor—a treaty that is a tribute to the willingness of the people of Israel and of Prime Minister Begin to take risks for peace. I say the first treaty because there must be—and there will be—more to come. For only in the context of true peace, freely negotiated, can there be true security for Israel and her neighbors.

Nothing is more crucial than building on this momentum. But, as has been obvious to all, the stalemate in the autonomy talks over the past 2 or more years, and the outbreak of major military conflict this past summer, pose a grave threat to further progress.

In these circumstances, President Reagan decided that the time had come for renewed American leadership. He acted, as well, because the Middle East today is at a moment of unprecedented opportunity: Israel, the moderate Arab states, the Palestinians, and the United States are all affected, and all now face the choice between hope and frustration, between peace and conflict.

Israel has demonstrated once again, at tragic cost, that it will not be defeated militarily. If Israel's adversaries want peace and justice they must recognize, clearly and explicitly, the right of the State of Israel to exist, and they must enter, as President Reagan said, "direct, hard, and fair" negotiations with Israel. When they do, Israel then has the chance to translate military strength into peace, the only long-term security.

For the moderate Arabs, there is the opportunity to demonstrate that the course of negotiations can produce results and serve their vital interests. For Lebanon, there is now a second chance; the chance once again to be free, prosperous, and democratic, posing no threat to its neighbors and serving as a stable bridge between the West and the Arab world.

The Palestinians now confront a great decision: whether to continue down the self-destructive road of armed struggle, which has only produced tragedy for the Palestinian people, or to seize the opportunity to affect their destiny by way of the peace process. The Camp David framework upholds the importance of self-government for the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza. And it provides Palestinian representatives the right to participate in the determination of their future at every step in that process.

For the United States, the brilliant, dogged diplomatic achievement of Presidential emissary Phil Habib has shown America's determination and ability to promote just and peaceful solutions to the problems of the area. His work is but the latest evidence of how crucial is the help of the United States if the peoples and nations of the region are to stop the fighting, construct solid agreements, and prevent wars between Arabs and Israelis from again threatening to become the focal point of global conflict.

In his historic address to the Israeli Knesset, Anwar Sadat spoke of "moments in the lives of nations and peoples when it is incumbent upon those known for their wisdom and clarity of vision, to penetrate beyond the past, with all its complexities and vain memories, in a bold drive toward new horizons." The present is such a moment for us all.

The President has offered a challenge—the challenge of peace—to Israelis and Arabs alike. Everyone talks so much about peace that it requires some effort to stop and comprehend what it really can mean. Relief from the horrible burden of war can unleash the full development of human potential, promising even greater creativity in the arts and sciences. Peace offers new economic possibilities—when the defense burden is lightened—to build a better life at home and contribute to the prosperity of the region and the world. Peace can mean fruitful economic cooperation between Israel and her neighbors. Imagine how the genius of the Israeli nation could flourish if it were freed from the physical and psychological burdens imposed by the continuing state of conflict. Imagine the enormous contribution that the peoples of this region—so rich in spiritual strength—could make to all mankind.

The Challenge to Israel

The challenge that the President has offered to Israel is to extend its hand to welcome wider participation in the peace process. Israel has demonstrated once more its military strength and bravery. But we all recognize that while true peace requires military strength, strength alone is not enough; true peace can only be achieved through lasting negotiated agreements leading ultimately to friendly cooperation between Israel and its neighbors.

In the 1948 war of independence Israel lost 6,000 dead, out of a population that was much smaller than it is today; it lost nearly 200 dead in 1956, nearly 700 in 1967, and hundreds more in the war of attrition that lasted until 1970; 2,800 young Israelis were killed in the 1973 war and more than 300 in 1982.

That terrible cycle of death and suffering must end. The evacuation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) from Beirut and the forceful demonstration of Israeli capability make this an altogether unique moment, a moment of opportunity to end this cycle. Triumphs of statecraft are decisions which join opportunity with action. If this opportunity is allowed to pass it may never come again.

The challenge Israel faces now is to combine diplomacy with power to build an enduring political settlement. There is nothing that says that Palestinian self-government in association with Jordan must lead inevitably to a Palestinian state. The President has said that we will not support such an outcome. It is not beyond the reach of diplomacy to create, nor Israeli military power to insure, that agreed arrangements for the West Bank will not erode over time. U.S. determination that concrete, ironclad arrangements for the security of Israel accompany the ultimate resolution of the Palestinian question is heightened, not diminished, by the fact that we have views on a desirable direction for the negotiations.

The crucial point is that when it comes to safeguarding the long-term security of Israel, the friendship and resolve of the United States are second in importance only to Israel's own resolution and strength. And, in the final analysis, that friendship and resolve deserve, in return, to be reciprocated by a willingness to listen with an open mind to the views of others. But let me be clear: We have a right to be heard but we have no intention of using our support for Israel's security as a way of imposing our views.

We must not underestimate the dilemmas and risks that Israel faces in opting for negotiations, but they are dwarfed by those created by a continuation of the status quo. The United States recognizes its obligations, as the principal supporter of Israel's security, to be understanding of Israel's specific circumstances in the negotiating process. The President has urged consideration of his proposals in the context of negotiations, to be undertaken without preconditions and with no thought of imposed solutions.

That is why the United States particularly asked that the parties themselves not preclude possible outcomes by concrete and perhaps irreversible actions undertaken before the process of negotiation is completed. While we support the right of Jews to live in peace on the West Bank and Gaza under the duly constituted governmental authority there—just as Arabs live in Israel—we regard the continuation of settlement activity prior to the conclusion of negotiations as detrimental to the peace process.

The Challenge to the Arabs

The President has offered a fundamental challenge to the Arabs as well. It is time for the Arab world to recognize the opportunity provided by Camp David. The path of rejection has achieved nothing but tragedy, particularly for the Palestinians. Surely, the pattern of agonies of this capable and courageous people must not be repeated. Alternatively, the Camp David process and the President's fresh start offers a promise of resolution with honor and justice to those with the wisdom to join the peace process. But it also implies a corollary: Those who fail to join will miss a precious opportunity—an opportunity for peace that may not come again soon.

The absence of Jordan and representatives of the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories from the negotiations has been the crucial missing link in the Camp David process. Success in the peace process depends on Arab support for these vital missing partners to join the negotiations and become partners for peace. We trust that support will be forthcoming soon. Our consultations with the Arab world will be designed to encourage such support. We recognize the risks to all parties, but the risks of failure are even greater. The Arab nations missed one chance for

peace when they rejected the 1947 U.N. partition plan. Then, for nearly two decades, they rejected the legitimacy of the boundaries within which the Israelis lived so insecurely prior to 1967. In 1978 they refused to support Egypt when the Camp David accords were signed. Today, the Arabs again have great opportunities: to move from belligerency to negotiation to peace; and to work realistically and practically for the rights of the Palestinians. But these opportunities, like the previous ones, will not last forever.

A "New Realism" for Us All

Thus for the Palestinians and other Arabs, and for Israel, this is indeed the moment, as the President said, for a "new realism." An element in that realism is that the United States has decided to state publicly where it stands on critical questions. There will be, as I have said, no imposed solutions: Any point agreed by Israel and its Arab neighbors will not be opposed by us. But at the same time, the United States is now obligated, by reality and morality alike, to make known its views on what we believe is needed to reach a fair, workable, and lasting solution. This the President did on the first of September. The President's initiative contains firm American principles; we will not depart from them. As we move ahead the United States, as a full partner, will reserve the right to support positions on either side when we feel this is likely to promote fair agreement. And we will put forward our own proposals when appropriate, to the same end. I reiterate, however, that no specific negotiated result is ruled out: That is the essence of the process.

We must also recognize another reality: The positions now held by the potential partners in negotiations are widely at variance. The point however is this: Any participant in this process—including the United States as a full partner—is free to have and to enunciate its positions. Once views are expressed, the place, indeed the only place, to thrash out differences is at the bargaining table. If there were no differences of opinion, there would be no need for negotiations.

The issues are complex, the emotions deep, the forces in the Middle East contentious, and the stakes so great. The wisdom of the peace process must spring from recognition of these facts. Bitterness dies hard, while trust grows slowly. President Reagan has now set out the lines of a fair and realistic solution; together with the other parties we should all come together to discuss and negotiate these matters.

There is no need now to agree on any principle but one: That is the need to come together at the bargaining table to talk—to talk about differences; to talk about aspirations; to talk about peace; but in all events to talk. We ask for nothing more of any of the participants at the beginning of the process. And we have the deepest duty and obligation to ask for no less.

If it takes more time, we are prepared for that. But there are limits—this opportunity must not be lost. One hundred and twenty years ago, Abraham Lincoln, speaking to the Congress of the United States, said that "The dogmas of the . . . past are inadequate to the . . . present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

In this spirit, and with the vision, self-confidence, and mutual trust that has marked our relationship at its best moments, Israel and America—and our Arab friends, now and in the future—can shape a life of dignity, justice, and true peace. ■

Published by the United States Department of State · Bureau of Public Affairs Office of Public Communication · Editorial Division · Washington, D.C. · September 1982
Editor: Colleen Sussman · This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

Bureau of Public Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

If address is incorrect
please indicate change.
Do not cover or destroy
this address label.

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501

Third Class Bulk Rate

U.S. MAIL